REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 1-3 are rejected. Specifically, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, in which new matter has been added too. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradshaw et al. (U. S. Patent 6,101,157; hereinafter Bradshaw). Claims 1-3 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. The Office Action specifically states that "*the correction offset signals are independent to gains of the amplifiers*" is not supported by the original disclosure. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

For example in FIG 2 (FIG 3 and FIG 4 are similar), the correction offset signals are input from the terminals 68 or 70 to the amplifiers 66A - 66D. Each amplifier has the gain G. However, the correction offset signals are input from the terminals 68 or 70 (see [0035]) to the amplifiers without relation with gain G. This is also one of the objective of the present invention to reduce the effect from the gain factor G of the amplifier. ***In other words, the correction offset signals do not include the gain information induced by the amplifiers, and therefore are independent from the gain factor G of the amplifiers.***

More specifically, Equation (4) and Equation (6) have disclosed that the correction offset signal

Vosadd (= - [(Va+Vb+Vc+Vd+ Vga+Vgb+Vgc+Vgd) / 4]) or Vossub (= - {[(Va+Vb+Vga+Vgb)-(Vc+Vd+Vgc+Vgd)]/4}) does not include the gain factor G in the equation, in which the effect from the gain factor G has been eliminated. In other words, the correction offset signal Vosadd or Vossub is independent to gain of the amplifiers 66A - 66D. Further, [0051] (page 16, lines 4-6) of the present invention has disclosed that the correction offset signal Vosadd does not include the gain G of the amplifiers.

Therefore, the discussed features are well supported by the original specifications.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradshaw. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Office Action has referred to amplifiers 36 and 37 in Fig. 2 of Bradshaw with related descriptions. It is apparent that the amplifier 36 produces the sum of a+d and the amplifier 37 produces the sum of b+c. Then, the amplifier 38 produces the quantity of [(a+d) + (b+c)] (col. 5, lines 44-46). Likewise, the amplifier 39 produces the quantity of [(a+d) - (b+c)] (col. 5, lines 59-61). Apparently, ***there is no any correction offset signal input to the four amplifiers 36 - 39.*** All the amplifiers only receive the outputs from the detector 35. The correction offset signal of the present invention is not disclosed by Bradshaw.

In addition, Bradshaw (col. 8, lines 56-63) clearly disclosed that it is to correct the offset change ***in association with the gain setting,*** the controller 9 executes an offset adjustment to the amplifiers 4 and 6 or adders 36 and 37by a construction with respect to the signals RF and FE (step 121). The controller 9 is basically performing the gain switching control but not for compensating or correcting

offset voltage. In addition, the signals RF and FE, output from the amplifiers 4 and 6, have carried the gain effects of the adding circuits 36 - 39. In other words, the offset adjustment is done after the signals RF and FE have been produced via a feedback route. This offset adjustment in Bradshaw is affected by gain setting, and therefore does not disclose the features of the present invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 patently defines over the prior art, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-3 patently define over the prior art as well.

Application No.: 09/940,349 **Docket No.:JCLA7911-R**

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-3 of the invention patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS

Date: 3/3/2006

Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809